

## COMMISSIONERS RECORD Q, DOUGLAS COUNTY

9

Term, 19

day of

19

Representatives John Vogel and Morris Kay, appeared before the Board to discuss the manner of enumeration of the residents of Douglas County.

No further business, the Board adjourned to meet on Wednesday, Dec. 27th.

ATTEST:

D. E. Mathia  
D. E. Mathia, County Clerk

Harvey M. Booth  
Harvey M. Booth, Chairman.

December 27, 1967.

The Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County met in regular adjourned session, with all members of the Board being present.

Approved the minutes of the meeting of December 22, 1967.

Board issued cereal malt beverage licenses to the following:  
Walter Cragan, Sirloin Club  
Marvin E. Jardon, Jardon's Service Station  
Don VanWinkle, The Flamingo Club  
J.C. Poindexter, Oak Lodge  
Joan S. Coffey, Mont Bleu Ski, Inc.  
Philip L. Bay, Jayhawk Speed Park  
Vernon L. May, May's Tavern  
Ida Mae Sweeney, Sweeney's Market  
Carol Miller, Miller's Bar-B-Que

Commissioners Cancellation Order No. 513 was approved by the Board and signed by the Chairman. Order is on file in the office of the County Clerk.

Board received a proposed agreement between the State Highway Commission of Kansas and the Douglas County, from Walter Johnson, State Highway Engineer. It was moved by Mr. Glass, seconded by Mr. Kampschroeder, that the agreement be accepted and executed by the Board. Motion carried.

Received correspondence from Mary H. Tyson, Ellinwood, Kansas, pertaining to taxes on property located in Baldwin, Kansas. Letter to be answered by Chairman, advising Mrs. Tyson of her rights of protesting the assessment.

Board received bids from the following, on new vehicles for the Road & Bridge Department, and for the County Park Department: Beedles Motor Company - Kuhn Truck & Tractor - Jim Clark Motor Co., - John Haddock Ford - Stevenson Olds - and Winter Chevrolet. Bids to be referred to County Engineer for compliance, with specifications and recommendations.

Board conducted special hearing on Sewer District No. 10, as provided for in legal notice, the following were present:

J. J. Lavery - Charles W. Bratton - R. A. Armstrong - L. O. Armstrong -  
Eleanor J. Armstrong - Mildred M. Dunnigan - C. K. Woodward - Linas E.  
Dietz - Eva M. Gill - Mr. & Mrs. J. L. Oehlert - Mrs. Herbert Hartman -  
Harold Hatfield - Raymond Nichols & R. K. Lawton,  
they had the following comments:

Attorney Gene Riling, representing Mr. & Mrs. Leland Armstrong, asked for a clarification of the assessment made on the University of Kansas Endowment Association, also pointed out that as far as his clients he felt this assessment was confiscation of their land due to the restrictive covenants of a will, under which Mr. Armstrong received only a life estate in the property. Desired to know how the valuation figure was established on the land.

Mr. Nichols and Mr. Lawton, of Kansas University, appeared to protest the inclusion of a tract of 5.7 acres of land, known as Pioneer Cemetery, which is restricted in use only as a cemetery. It is the feeling of the University that this assessment is not just.

Mr. J. J. Lavery requested information as to the breakdown of costs on the whole district. Was advised that the records were available at the office of the County Clerk.

Mr. Steve Sublet asked for a clarification of the manner of assessment.

Mr. Oehlert advised that he would like to be able to get some of his money back and could not see any manner in which he could ever get anything for his money.

Mrs. Oehlert questioned the petition that was presented in opposition to the creation of the sewer district, she alleged that it represented 51% of the landowners. Mr. Stough advised that the law provided that a protest would have to have more than 51% of the area, and that the numerical number of land owners had no bearing.

Mr. Linas Dietz asked why the assessment figure changed between the first and second notice and if Haskell Inst. was a part of this district. Also, desired to know why, since he was in the city and already on the sewer, why he was included in District No. 10.

Mrs. Mildred M. Dunnigan asked for an explanation of the interest cost and the one half of 1% delinquency charge, that will be included in the total cost.

Mrs. Leland Armstrong questioned as to why this district was created under one statute and Riverside District was created under another statute. Also, desired to know who originally asked for District No. 10 to be created. No records available as to any petition ever have been received requesting the creation of the district.

Chairman Booth advised the group that a final decision by the Board would be made by Friday, December 29, 1967.